

**STATE COMMITTEE OF INTERPRETERS
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 MISSOURI BOULEVARD
Jefferson City, MO**

**March 27, 2002
Open Minutes**

The open session of the State Committee of Interpreters was called to order by Loretto Durham, Chair, at 2:45pm on March 27, 2002 at the Division of Professional Registration, 3605 Missouri Blvd, Jefferson City, Missouri, via conference call.

Members Present:

Loretto Durham – by telephone
Carrie McCray – by telephone
Kim McEnulty – by telephone
Sandy Drummond – by telephone
Lisa Guillory – by telephone

Staff Present:

Pamela Goose, Executive Director – in person
Roxy Brockman, Clerk IV – in person
Karen Hess, Asst Attorney General – by telephone

Visitors:

Roy Miller, Executive Director – MCD
Roger Brown, MCD

Review and Approval of Agenda:

A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Ms. Drummond to approve the agenda. All approved.

Rules:

- *MCD/BCI Rules effective March 30, 2002* -- The Committee members discussed the MCD/BCI rule (5 CSR 100-200.085 Intern/Practicum Certification) that is going into effect on March 30, 2002.

A motion was made by Dr. Guillory and seconded by Ms. Drummond to close for #2 at 2:51pm. Ms. McEnulty, Dr. Guillory, Ms. Drummond and Ms. McCray all approved.

- *Discussion of 5 CSR 100-200.085*

Ms. Drummond provided some background information in regard to the creation of the intern practicum certification rule. She said since the beginning of the State Committee of Interpreters establishing rules back in 1997 – 1998 we have known we could not license student interpreters because they did not have certification. She said the SCI raised this issue with the BCI a few years ago in a meeting that occurred approximately in January 2000. She said the BCI was told that the SCI could not license students until they had certification. She said the BCI developed a certification so we could license the students. She said we are at the point where we need to figure out how to license the students and she personally feels there should be some form of licensure over student interpreters. She said she remembers prior to passing legislation that

created the certification system, one of the major complaints was that student interpreters were out working in the emergency rooms and doing lots of things they shouldn't be doing. The main pushes that encouraged everyone to see the need for certification system. So she feels strongly the need for licensing student interpreters. She suggested a way to handle this would be to introduce another change to the statute that would allow for a separate license for student interpreters, which would be different from the permanent and temporary licenses. She said she also realizes that this would take a while to accomplish. She said in the mean time she would be willing to see student interpreters given the permanent license with the understanding that we would also pass rules saying that they could interpret in a situation where they have supervision that was approved by their college and things like that. She said she would also recommend other changes to the rules in the Code of Ethics that would provide some supervision of these student interpreters.

Ms. McEnulty said she agreed with Ms. Drummond in regard to a separate language that specifically refers to the students in a program and in the mean time adding something to the rules that clearly states they have to be under supervision of some kind while they are working. She said she thought this was an excellent idea. Dr. Guillory indicated that she also agreed.

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McEnulty that we make a change to the statute that creates a separate license for student interpreters in an intern or practicum course within an interpreter training program that is recognized by the Board for Certification of Interpreters (BCI) and housed in a regionally accredited institution of higher education. All approved. Ms. Drummond recommended taking some of the language from the BCI rules and make sure it is in the same type of program that the BCI is approving. The committee requested that Ms. Hess prepare a draft of the proposed language and bring to the next meeting in May.

Ms. Durham said students would be getting certification this semester and asked if we would issue a license according to current statute. The committee members discussed the procedures for issuing a license to student interpreters.

Ms. Goose confirmed each student license could be issued with a different start and end date, they did not all need to be the same. She said licenses could be issued based upon the certification issued by the BCI and BCI rules say the director or the coordinator of the program is responsible for notifying the BCI of the effective start and end date of the ITP

Ms. McEnulty asked Dr. Miller to explain the process for issuing a student certification. Dr. Miller said they would get applications from the ITP directors and the applications specify a start date and an end date. He said that date may be three (3) months, six (6) months, or one (1) year. He said there isn't any standard start and end date.

Ms. Durham asked if a fee rule would have to be promulgated for the student interpreter licenses and Ms. Goose indicated that it was not necessary as the SCI already as an application fee and this could be used for the student interpreter licenses.

Dr. Miller asked why the committee felt the better long term solution was to start a new license ie student license/intern license, require the students to complete another application and pay additional fees when you could simply go into the law and add it to the exemptions statute.

Ms. Drummond responded that she had concerns, that she believed that student interpreters should be supervised by a certified and licensed interpreter. She said we could promulgate rules in our Code of Ethics that requires that, but we have no authority over unlicensed interpreters. Ms. Drummond said the Code of Ethics would mean nothing to a student

interpreter that is not required to be licensed. She said If we could license them, at the very least we could keep a file of complaints against their student license and regardless of how much authority we have or don't have it has been a very large problem in the past. She said she has a man on video tape telling her about how he used to convince student interpreters to go and interpret in the emergency rooms in St Louis because they were cheaper than paying the level fives. She said it was a long standing practice for a long time prior to certification and she has seen students before who think they know more than they should. She said this was one way of starting a file and getting them into the system. She said her main concern is that we would not be able to require supervision of the students and not be able to require that they follow the code of ethics.

Ms. McEnulty indicated this would provide for the welfare of the consumer if there is a process in place they can follow through with if something should go wrong.

Dr. Miller said he understood but disagreed.

Ms. Drummond said at this point we have already decided to eventually go ahead and establish a student license.

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Dr. Guillory to generate rules for the code of ethics that require anyone holding an intern practicum certificate and license only operate under that license with the supervision of a certified and licensed interpreter. All approved.

Ms. Drummond indicated that she did not specify in her motion the level of certification that the supervisor must hold and Ms. Groose said this could be discussed at the next meeting when Ms. Hess provides the draft language.

Dr. Miller asked the committee members if they could clarify their intent in regard to language involving supervision, if it meant one-to-one supervision or one-to-many supervision. Ms. Drummond said her intent was that a student interpreter will not practice interpreting unless a certified and licensed interpreter is observing them, ready to take over at any moment. That does not necessarily mean that there has to be a one-on-one correlation between the licensed interpreter and the student interpreter. But, she said, it does mean that every time a student interpreter is working, a licensed interpreter is observing them and ready to take over at any point.

Dr. Miller said if you do this you are clearly putting the MCD Deaf Awareness Days out of business. He said he wanted the Committee to understand the implication of their action. Ms. Durham suggested that it may be possible to get licensed interpreters to volunteer their time during these kinds of functions as she knew that some licensed interpreters have volunteered in the past. She said if the word got out there may be more licensed interpreters volunteering. Ms. Drummond said there is nothing to say that those student interpreters who volunteer for Deaf Awareness Day to earn hours or credits towards their internship or practicum course couldn't bring their supervising interpreter with them to observe them while they do their work. She said that's often how internship and practicum assignments are completed through William Woods. She said sometimes the students arrange for interpreting assignments and ask their supervising interpreter to accompany them, to observe and evaluate them at events like Deaf Awareness day, a public event where there may not even be any deaf people there, but the supervising interpreter goes along so they can count those hours towards their internship and the student gets that experience. She said those types of assignments could continue, this does not prevent those assignments from continuing it would just have to be done in a different way. She said personally doesn't see the benefit of having student interpreters interpreting

events that are supposed to increase awareness about deafness or about the deaf community when the when the students are students. Ms. Drummond said most of them are not typically competent at interpreting but if they had a supervisor there, the supervisor would be responsible for taking over and supporting that person. She said she didn't think that this was an argument that would sway her from this rule. She said she believed that it is important that all student interpreters have a supervising interpreter at all times.

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Dr. Guillory to go ahead and start licensing student interpreters with the system that Ms. Goose has developed now until the separate student license is in place with the understanding that they would follow the same beginning and expiration dates as the intern/practicum certification.

Ms. Drummond explained her reasoning for proposing this motion and that was since we were the ones who encouraged the BCI to develop this certification and we are the ones requiring licensure. She said she thought BCI was ready to go forward with the certification and that we should have a something in place, even if SCI members are a little leery. She said she thought over the next 2 or 3 years until a separate license is developed and everything is a little firmer we should have a license in place, ready and available at the same time that the intern/practicum certification is available.

Ms. Hess requested that the committee go into closed for #2.

Ms. Drummond asked how this would be communicated to the ITPs. Ms. Goose indicated that she and Ms. Brockman had talked this, that an application could be created quickly and send several packets to the ITPs. Ms. Drummond asked if all students would have this practicum certification and if they are aware of the certification. Mr. Brown responded yes, they were aware of the certification and they are applying. Dr. Miller verified certifications would be mailed out after the March 30, 2002. Ms. Drummond recommended that a letter and application forms be sent out to ITP directors. She said if the ITP directors need someone to come and talk to students, they can contact the office and whoever is closest to the area where the ITP is located can go to that location. She also recommended that we send additional letters informing ITP directors of the upcoming rule discussion in May.

Next meeting May 14, 2002 from 10am to 4pm in at the Professional Registration Building, Jefferson City, Missouri.

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Ms. McCray to adjourn at 3:51pm. All approved.

Executive Director

Date approved by committee